

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/659,264	09/11/2000	Raymond Anthony Joao	RJ167	5602
7	590 03/08/2005		EXAM	INER
Raymond A Joao Esq 122 Bellevue Place Yonkers, NY 10703		FISCHER, ANDREW J		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	
			DATE MAILED: 03/08/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
6/	/	09/659,264	JOAO, RAYMONI	O ANTHON
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Andrew J. Fischer	3627	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	ldress
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a poperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day it will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from atute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timel the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	<u>1 March 2003</u> .		
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b) 🖂 T	his action is non-final.		
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex par</i> te <i>Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 57-92 is/are pending in the applica	ition.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	frawn from consideration.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) <u>57-92</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.		
Applicati	ion Papers			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) \square objected to by the $\mathfrak l$	Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the contract of the contract		• •	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	rection is required if the drawing(s) is obj	ected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached Office	Action or form PT	ГО-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Ackno	wledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a)∐ All	b) Some * c) None of:
1.	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2.	Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No
3.	Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the	attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

1) 🛛	Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
21 🖂	Notice of Droftonomon's Detait Descripe Device

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date

4) 🔲	Interview Summary (PTO-413
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

	Other:
01	Ouiei.

Attachment(s)

ANTHONY

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 C.F.R. §1.114

1. A request for continued examination ("RCE") under 37 C.F.R. §1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e), was filed in this on March 11, 2003 (Paper No. 7). This application was under a final rejection (the First Final Office Action, mailed January 2, 2003, Paper No. 5) and is therefore eligible for continued examination under 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

Because the fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality in the previous First Final Office Action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.114.

Acknowledgements

- 2. In accordance with the RCE noted above, Applicant's amendment filed March 11, 2003 is acknowledged. Accordingly, claims 57-92 remain pending.
- 3. The examiner for this application has changed. Please indicate Examiner Andrew J. Fischer as the examiner of record in all future correspondences.
- 4. All references in this Office Action to the capitalized versions of "Applicant" refers specifically the Applicant of record. References to lower case versions of "applicant" or "applicants" refers to any or all patent "applicants." Unless expressly noted otherwise, references to "Examiner" in this Office Action refers to the Examiner of record while reference to or use of the lower case version of "examiner" refers to examiner(s) generally.
- 5. This Office Action is written in OACS. Because of this, the Examiner is unable to control formatting, paragraph numbering, font, spelling, line spacing, and/or other word processing issues. The Examiner sincerely apologies for these errors.

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §112 2nd Paragraph

Page 3

6. The following is a quotation of the 2nd paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 7. Claims 57-92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are replete with errors. Some examples follow.
 - a. In at least claim 57, it is unclear if the request includes a request "to receive" a printed issue must occur at a retail facility or if one simply picks up the printed issue at the retail facility.
 - b. In at least claims 57, 70, 77, 86, 87, and 90-92, it is unclear if the list of items (i.e. "a periodical, a newspaper, and a magazine") is a conjunctive list requiring all 3 items in the list for anticipation/infringement, or a disjunctive list requiring just one of the items in the list for anticipation/infringement.
 - c. In at least claim 57, it is unclear what the "at least one" in line 9 is in reference to. In the same section, it is unclear if the list of items if the list of items (*i.e.* "a status of the subscription" or "a number of issues") is a conjunctive list requiring both items in the list for anticipation/infringement, or a disjunctive list requiring just one of the items in the list for anticipation/infringement.

The Examiner highly recommends Applicant review all pending claims for this type of error. In particular, Applicant should clarify if lists of items as claimed are disjunctive or conjunctive.

Art Unit: 3627

Page 4

- d. In at least claim 65, the phrase, "where the processing device at least one of records" does not make grammatical sense. "A claim must be read in accordance with the precepts of English grammar." *In re Hyatt*, 708 F.2d 712, 714, 218 USPQ 195, 197 (Fed. Cir. 1983).
- 8. The Examiner finds that because the claims are indefinite under 35 U.S.C. §112 2nd paragraph, it is impossible to properly construe claim scope at this time. See *Honeywell International Inc. v. ITC*, 68 USPQ2d 1023, 1030 (Fed. Cir. 2003) ("Because the claims are indefinite, the claims, by definition, cannot be construed."). However, in accordance with MPEP §2173.06 and the USPTO's policy of trying to advance prosecution by providing art rejections even though these claim are indefinite, the claims are construed and the art is applied *as much as practically possible*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office Action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. . . .
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 10. Claims 57-92, as understood by the Examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Loeb et. al. (U.S. 6,014,641)("Loeb"). Loeb discloses a receiver (the

Art Unit: 3627

network interface card that connects central agent 110 to the Internet); a processing device (the CPU with central agent 110); a transmitter (the connection to supplier 130); an input device (a keyboard); a display device (a computer monitor); an output device (a printer); and a memory device (the memory with any of the various computers disclosed).

Page 5

11. Claims 57-92, as understood by the Examiner, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Loeb.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

- 12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office Action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 13. Claims 57-92, as understood by the Examiner, are alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Loeb. It is the Examiner's principle position that the claims are anticipated because the claimed use is inherent in the disclosed structure.

However if not inherent, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Loeb and separately delineate a separate processor, transmitter, and receiver since these separate device may or may be performed with by the CPU in central agent 110. Such a modification would have simply provided a better description of that which is inherent.

¹ See MPEP §2112 expressly authorizing alternative §102/§103 rejections when the question of inherency is present in the anticipation rejection.

- Regarding at least claims 57, Applicant is reminded that providing an automatic means to replace a manual activity which accomplishes the same result is not sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art in terms of patentability. *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 93, 94 (CCPA 1958). See MPEP §2144.04 III and *e.g.* Brown (U.S. 5,875,435) as evidence that automating an accounting system is old and well known in the art.
- 15. Regarding the "information" in at least claim 92, it is the Examiner's position that because Applicant has chosen product claims, the information is regarded as nonfunctional descriptive material.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the content of Loeb with any type of content. The descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art in terms of patentability because the data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method. See *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994). See also MPEP §2106 IV B.

- 16. The Examiner takes Official Notice that smart cards, credit card, charge cards, and debit cards are old and well known in the art.
- 17. After careful review of the specification and prosecution history, the Examiner is unaware of any desire—either expressly or implicitly—by Applicant to be his own lexicographer and to define a claim term to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustomed meaning. Therefore, the Examiner starts with the heavy presumption that all claim limitations are given their ordinary and accustomed meaning. See *Bell Atlantic Network Services Inc. v. Covad Communications Group Inc.*, 262 F.3d 1258, 1268, 59 USPQ2d 1865, 1870 (Fed. Cir. 2001)("[T]here is a heavy presumption in favor of the ordinary meaning of claim language as

understood by one of ordinary skill in the art."); CCS Fitness Inc. v. Brunswick Corp., 288 F.3d 1359,1366, 62 USPQ2d 1658, 1662 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (There is a "heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning."). See also MPEP §2111.01 and In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989).²

In accordance with the ordinary and accustomed meaning presumption, during examination the claims are interpreted with their "broadest reasonable interpretation" *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027 (Fed. Cir. 1997). See also MPEP §2111.

However, if Applicant disagrees with the Examiner and has either (a) already used lexicography or (b) wishes to use lexicography and therefore (under either (a) or (b)) desires a claim limitation to have a meaning other than its ordinary and accustomed meaning, the Examiner respectfully requests Applicant in his next response to expressly indicate³ the claim limitation at issue and to show where in the specification or prosecution history the limitation is defined. Such definitions must be clearly stated in the specification or file history. *Bell Atlantic*, 262 F.3d at 1268, 59 USPQ2d at 1870, ("[I]n redefining the meaning of particular claim terms away from the ordinary meaning, the intrinsic evidence must 'clearly set forth' or 'clearly

² It is the Examiner's position that "plain meaning" and "ordinary and accustomed meaning" are synonymous. See e.g. *Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.*, 274 F.3d 1336, 1342, 60 USPQ2d 1851, 1854 (Fed. Cir. 2001) ("[A]ll terms in a patent claim are to be given their plain, ordinary and accustomed meaning...").

³ "Absent an express intent to impart a novel meaning, terms in a claim are to be given their ordinary and accustomed meaning. [Emphasis added.]" Wenger Manufacturing Inc. v. Coating Mach. Sys., Inc., 239 F.3d 1225, 1232, 57 USPQ2d 1679, 1684 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (citations and quotations omitted). "In the absence of an express intent to impart a novel meaning to claim terms, an inventor's claim terms take on their ordinary meaning. We indulge a heavy presumption that a claim term carries its ordinary and customary meaning. [Emphasis added.]" Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North America Corp., 299 F.3d 1313, 1325, 63 USPQ2d 1374, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (citations and quotations omitted).

Page 8

Art Unit: 3627

redefine' a claim term so as to put one reasonably skilled in the art on notice that the patentee intended to so redefine the claim term"). The Examiner cautions that no new matter is allowed. Applicant is reminded that failure by Applicant in his next response to properly traverse this issue in accordance with 37 C.F.R §1.111(b) or to be non-responsive to this issue entirely will be considered a desire by Applicant to forgo lexicography in this application and to continue having the claims interpreted with their broadest reasonable interpretation. Additionally, it is the Examiner's position that the above requirements are reasonable. Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the preceding discussion on claim interpretation principles applies to all examined claims currently pending.

18. To the extent that the Examiner's interpretations are in dispute with Applicant's interpretations, the Examiner hereby adopts the following definitions—under the broadest

⁴ See also *Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.*, 90 F.3d 1576, 1582, 39 USPQ2d 1573, 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996), ("[A] patentee may choose to be his own lexicographer and use terms in a manner other than their ordinary meaning, as long as the special definition of the term is clearly stated in the patent specification or file history. [Emphasis added.]"); *Multiform Desiccants Inc. v. Medzam Ltd.*, 133 F.3d 1473, 1477, 45 USPQ2d 1429, 1432 (Fed. Cir. 1998) ("Such special meaning, however, must be sufficiently clear in the specification that any departure from common usage would be so understood by a person of experience in the field of the invention."). See also MPEP §2111.01, subsection titled "Applicant May Be Own Lexicographer" and MPEP §2173.05(a) titled "New Terminology."

⁵ See 37 C.F.R. §1.104(c)(3) which states in part: "the examiner may rely upon admissions by applicant . . . as to *any matter* affecting patentability [Emphasis added.]"

The Examiner's requirements on this matter are reasonable on at least two separate and independent grounds. First, the Examiner's requirements are simply an express request for clarification of how Applicant intends his claims to be interpreted so that lexicography (or even an *attempt* at lexicography) by Applicant is not inadvertently overlooked by the Examiner. Second, the requirements are reasonable in view of the USPTO's goals of compact prosecution, productivity with particular emphasis on reductions in both pendency and cycle time, and other goals as outlined in the USPTO's The 21st Century Strategic Plan, February 3, 2003 available at www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/strat21/index.htm (last accessed February 27, 2005).

Page 9

Art Unit: 3627

reasonable interpretation standard—in all his claim interpretations. Moreover, while the following list is provided in accordance with In re Morris, the definitions are a guide to claim terminology since claim terms must be interpreted in context of the surrounding claim language.8 Finally, the following list is not intended to be exhaustive in any way:

Server: "2. On the Internet or other network, a computer or program that responds to commands from a client." Computer Dictionary, 3rd Edition, Microsoft Press, Redmond, WA, 1997. Client: "3. On a local area network or Internet, a computer that accesses shared network resources provided by another computer (called a server)." Id. Computer: "Any machine that does three things: accepts structured input, processes it according to prescribed rules, and produces the results as output." Id.

Internet "The worldwide collection of networks and gateways that use the TCP/IP suite of protocols to communicate with one another. At the heart of the Internet is a backbone of highspeed data communication lines between major nodes or host computers, consisting of thousands

While most definition(s) are cited because these terms are found in the claims, the Examiner may have provided additional definition(s) to help interpret words, phrases, or concepts found in the definitions themselves or in the prior art.

⁸ See e.g. Brookhill-Wilk 1 LLC v. Intuitive Surgical Inc., 334 F.3d 1294, 1300, 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1137 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (abstract dictionary definitions are not alone determinative; "resort must always be made to the surrounding text of the claims in question").

⁹ Based upon Applicant's disclosure, the art of record, and the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in this art as determined by the factors discussed in MPEP §2141.03 (where practical), the Examiner finds that the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary is an appropriate technical dictionary known to be used by one of ordinary skill in this art. See e.g. Altiris Inc. v. Symantec Corp., 318 F.3d 1363, 1373, 65 USPQ2d 1865, 1872 (Fed. Cir. 2003) where the Federal Circuit used the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (3d ed.) as "a technical dictionary" to define the term "flag." See also In re Barr, 444 F.2d 588, 170 USPO 330 (CCPA 1971)(noting that its appropriate to use technical dictionaries in order to ascertain the meaning of a term of art) and MPEP §2173.05(a) titled 'New Terminology.'

Art Unit: 3627

of commercial, government, educational, and other computer systems, that route data and messages." <u>Id</u>.

Data "Plural of the Latin datum, meaning an item of information. In practice, data is often used for the singular as well as plural the form of the noun." Id.

Network "A group of computers and associated network devices that are connected by communications facilities." Id.

Web site "A group of related HTML documents and associated files, scripts, and databases that is served up by an HTTP server on the World Wide Web. The HTML documents in a Web site generally cover one or more related topics and are interconnected through hyperlinks. Most Web sites have a home page as their starting point, which frequently functions as a table of contents for the site. Many large organizations, such as corporations, will have one or more HTTP servers dedicated to a single Web site. However, an HTTP server can also serve several small Web sites, such as those owned by individuals. Users need a Web browser and an Internet connection to access a Web site." Id. HTTP Sever 1. Server software that uses HTTP to serve up HTML documents and any associated files and scripts when requested by a client, such as a Web browser. The connection between client and server is usually broken after the requested document or file has been served. HTTP servers are used on Web and Intranet sites. Also called Web Sever 2. Any machine on which an HTTP server program is running." Id.

Associate: "1: closely connected with one another . . ." Merriam-Webster's Collegiate

Dictionary, 10th Edition, Merriam-Webster Inc., Springfield, M.A., 1997 ("Collegiate

Dictionary").

For "1 a — used as a function word to indicate purpose <a grant ~ studying medicine>" Id.

Information "2 a . . . (3): FACTS, DATA . . . " Id.

In light of the Examiner's use of the Collegiate Dictionary noted above, and because applicants frequently misunderstand the historical order of definitions and their corresponding senses, the following excerpts from the "Explanatory Notes" in the Collegiate Dictionary are provided:

Definitions

Division of Senses

A boldface colon is used in this dictionary to introduce a definition. . . . It is also used to separate two or more definitions of a single sense. . . . Boldface Arabic numerals separate senses of a word that has more than one sense. . . . Boldface lowercase letters separate the subsenses of a word. . . . Lightface numerals in parentheses indicate a further division of senses. . . .

Order of Senses

The order of senses within an entry is historical: the sense known to have been first used in English is entered first. This is not to be taken to mean, however, that each sense of a multisense word developed from the immediately preceding sense. It is altogether possible that sense 1 of a word has given rise to sense 2 and sense 2 to sense 3, but frequently sense 2 and sense 3 may have risen independently of one another from sense 1.

- 20. When a number sense is further subdivided into lettered subsenses, the include of particular subsenses with a sense is based upon their semantic relationship to one another, but their order is likewise historical: subsense la is earlier than subsense lb, lb is earlier than lc, and so forth. Divisions of subsenses indicated by lightface numerals in parentheses are also in historical order with respect to one another. Subsenses may be out of historical order, however, with respect to the broader numbered senses. Collegiate Dictionary, pp 19a-20a.
- 21. Regarding the conditional language in the claims such as "or" or "at least one of,"

 Applicant is reminded of the USPTO's policy regarding such conditional language. "Language that suggest or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a

claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. [Emphasis in original.]" MPEP §2106 II C.

- Furthermore, the Examiner notes claim 57 begins "An apparatus" Additionally, "[c]laims in apparatus form conventionally fall into the 35 U.S.C. §101 statutory category of a 'machine." *Ex parte Donner*, 53 USPQ2d 1699, 1701 (B.P.A.I. 1999)(unpublished), (Paper No. 34, page 5, issued as U.S. Patent 5,999,907). Products may be either machines, manufactures, or compositions of matter. MPEP §2106 IV *B*. 2 (a). The Examiner therefore finds that Applicant's apparatus claims are clearly "product" claims or more specifically, "machine" claims.
- 23. In light of Applicant's choice to pursue apparatus, product, and machine claims as noted above, Applicant is reminded that functional recitations using the word "for," "adapted to," or other functional terms (e.g. see claim 57 which recites "for receiving a request to receive or pick-up a printed issue of at least one of a periodical, a newspaper, and a magazine at a retail facility or store pursuant to a subscription") have been considered but are given little patentable weight because they fail to add any structural limitations and are thereby regarded as intended use language. A recitation of the intended use in a product claim must result in a structural difference between the claimed product and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed product from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it reads on the claimed limitation. In re Casey, 370 F.2d 576, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) ("The manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself."); In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963). See

¹⁰ See e.g. *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983)(stating that although all limitations must be considered, not all limitations are entitled to patentable weight.).

also MPEP §§ 2114 and 2115. Unless expressly noted otherwise by the Examiner, the claim interpretation principles in this paragraph apply to all examined claims currently pending.

24. Additionally, the Examiner notes that "the PTO and the CCPA acknowledged product-by-process claims as an exception to the general rule requiring claims to define products in terms of structural characteristics." *Atlantic Thermoplastics Co. v. Faytex Corp.*, 970 F.2d 834, 845, 23 USPQ2d 1481, 1490 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (hereinafter "*Atlantic Thermoplastics v. Faytex I*"). Furthermore, the Federal Circuit "acknowledges that it has in effect recognized . . . product-by-process claims as exceptional." *Atlantic Thermoplastics v. Faytex I*, 970 F.2d at 847, 23 USPQ2d at 1491.

Because of this exceptional status, the Examiner has carefully reviewed the claims and it is the Examiner's position that claims 57-92 *do not* contain any product-by-process limitations whether in a conventional format or otherwise. If Applicant disagrees with the Examiner, the Examiner respectfully requests Applicant in his next response to expressly point out any product-by-process claim(s) and their limitations so that they may be afforded their exceptional status and treated accordingly. Applicant is reminded that "even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself." *In re Thorpe*, 777 F.2d 695, 697, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985) (citations omitted). Failure by Applicant in his next response to also address this issue in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) or to be non-responsive to this issue entirely will be considered intent by Applicant *not* to recite any product-by-process limitations. Unless expressly noted otherwise

¹¹ See also MPEP §2113.

by the Examiner, the preceding discussion on product-by-process principles applies to all examined claims currently pending.

Response to Arguments

25. Applicant's arguments filed March 11, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the prior art, Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

- 26. References considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure are listed on form PTO-892.
- The following two (2) citations to the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure ("MPEP") apply to this Office Action: MPEP citations to Chapters 100, 200, 500, 600, 700, 1000, 1100, 1300, 1400, 1500, 1700, 1800, 2000, 2100, 2200, 2500, 2600, and 2700 are from the MPEP 8th Edition, Rev. 2, May 2004. All remaining MPEP citations are from MPEP 8th Edition, August 2001.
- 28. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).
- 29. In accordance with *In re Lee*, 277 F.3d 1338, 1344-45, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1434-35 (Fed. Cir. 2002), the Examiner finds that the references <u>How Computers Work Millennium Ed.</u> by Ron

White; How Networks Work, Millennium Ed. by Frank J. Derfler et. al.; and How the Internet Works, Millennium Ed. by Preston Gralla are additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. Each reference is cited in its entirety.

Moreover, because these three references are directed towards beginners (see e.g. "User Level Beginning . . ."), because of the references' basic content (which is self-evident upon review of the references), and after further review of the entire application and all the art now of record in conjunction with the factors as discussed in MPEP §2141.03 (where practical), the Examiner finds that these three references are primarily directed towards those of low skill in this art.

Because these three references are directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of ordinary skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of and understand the knowledge and information contained within these three references.

Also in accordance with *In re Lee*, the Examiner finds that Nathan J. Muller's <u>Desktop Encyclopedia of the Internet</u>, ("Desktop Encyclopedia") is additional evidence of what is basic knowledge or common sense to one of ordinary skill in this art. Muller's Desktop Encyclopedia is a practical reference that clearly explains Internet services, applications, protocols, access methods, development tools, administration and management, standards, and regulations.

Because of the reference's basic content (which is self-evident upon examination of the reference) and after further review of the entire record including the prior art now of record in conjunction with the factors as discussed in MPEP §2141.03 (where practical), the Examiner finds that the Desktop Encyclopedia is primarily directed towards those of low skill in this art.

Because the reference is directed towards those of low skill in this art, the Examiner finds that one of ordinary skill in this art must—at the very least—be aware of and understand the knowledge and information contained within the Desktop Encyclopedia.

Page 16

Art Unit: 3627

In accordance with the USPTO's goals of customer service, compact prosecution, and 31. reduction of cycle time, the Examiner has made every effort to clarify his position regarding claim interpretation and any rejections or objections in this application. Furthermore, the Examiner has provided Applicant with notice—for due process purposes—of his position regarding his factual determinations and legal conclusions. If Applicant disagrees with any factual determination or legal conclusion made by the Examiner in this Office Action whether expressly stated or implied, 12 the Examiner respectfully reminds Applicant to properly traverse the Examiner's position(s) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.111(b) in his next response. By addressing these issues now, matters where the Examiner and Applicant agree can be eliminated allowing the Examiner and Applicant to focus on areas of disagreement (if any) with the goal towards allowance in the shortest possible time. If Applicant has any questions regarding the Examiner's positions or has other questions regarding this communication or even previous communications, Applicant is strongly encouraged to contact Examiner Andrew J. Fischer whose telephone number is (703) 305-0292. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's immediate supervisor, Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183. To respond to this Office Action by facsimile, fax to (703) 872-9306.

> Andrew J. Fischer Patent Examiner Art Unit 3627

12 Turcher 2/27/05

AJF February 27, 2005

¹² E.g., if the Examiner rejected a claim under §103 with two references, although not directly stated, it is the Examiner's implied position that the references are analogous art.